1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 Mr. Juan Conce, in consideration of the offense of 3 which you stand convicted, the information from the United 4 States Attorney -- offenses of which you stand convicted, 5 the information from the United States Attorney, your 6 attorney, the probation officer and yourself, this Court 7 sentences you to 262 months in the custody of the United 8 States Attorney General on each of the counts of conviction, the sentence on each count to run concurrent one with the 9 10 other. 11 The Court places you on supervised release 12 thereafter for a period of eight years. The Court does not 13 impose a fine solely due to your inability to pay a fine. 14 The Court imposes the \$200 special assessment required by 15 the law. 16 The special conditions of your supervised release are that you are prohibited from possessing a firearm or 17 18 other dangerous weapon. You're to participate in a program 19 for substance abuse which program may include testing not to 20 exceed 104 drug tests per year to see whether you have 21 reverted to the use of alcohol or drugs. You're required to 22 contribute to the costs of those services. If deported 23 you're ordered to leave the United States, not to return 24 without the prior permission of the Secretary of the 25 Department of Homeland Security. You're to use your true

1 name, and you're prohibited from using any aliases or false 2 identifiers. 3 Let me explain the sentence. It is -- and I 4 certainly didn't add anything to this. Mr. Hrones has ably 5 argued a legal point on your behalf. You have every right 6 to appeal from any findings or rulings, and I suggest this 7 business about prior convictions is a ruling, that this 8 Court has made against you. If your appeal, if you take an appeal and your appeal is successful in whole or in part, 9 10 unless otherwise directed by the Court of Appeals you will 11 be resentenced before another judge. 12 But I tell you this. It's just disingenuous, I 13 don't think it's true for you to say you didn't know that 14 you were going to get a sentence in this range. This range was fully communicated to you. That doesn't take away from 15 the legal argument that Mr. Hrones makes on your behalf. 16 17 But we very well knew what the prior convictions were. I didn't ask you whether you admitted to them. You did not 18 19 admit to them. But I told you I was taking them into account and the range was fully discussed. 20 This is the sentence required by the law and the 21 22 Court imposes it upon you as a just sentence. 23 You are entitled to credit for this -- well, first, 24 I accept your request and will make the recommendation on 25 the judgment that you serve the sentence at a corrections

facility in south Florida. I can only recommend, but I have 1 2 no hesitancy in so recommending. 3 Moreover, you are entitled to credit from February 4 24th, 2004, towards the service of this sentence. 5 MR. HRONES: Your Honor, I have one issue. How 6 come you haven't given an alternative sentence as you did 7 two days ago in the Baez case. 8 THE COURT: Ah. Because in the Baez case, and you're quite right to raise it, in the Baez case I came on 9 the bench -- for one thing, it had been fully briefed in 10 11 both, by both parties, the issue of whether the guidelines 12 were unconstitutional on their face, something I have never 13 held. And I came on the bench, regretfully, unprepared. 14 And they briefed it and I considered it but I had not had adequate reflection. So, I, so I gave an alternative 15 16 sentence. Some of my colleagues have. 17 Since that time, I have engaged in some reflection, 18 and while I have not written a written opinion, and while 19 it's conceivable I may revisit it, I have read with great 20 care Judge Keeton's opinion in United States v. Sisson where 21 he finds, as I did in United States v. Green, that the 22 United States Sentencing Guidelines are unconstitutional as 23 applied and then goes on to find further that they are 24 severable.

Now, a number of my colleagues and indeed other

25

courts have held that they're not severable, and therefore 1 2 there's the belief on the part of those judges that they'll 3 be unconstitutional on their face and it will be a matter of 4 discretion. 5 I hadn't thought that issue through a couple of 6 days ago. I now have. In reliance on United States v. 7 Sisson, Judge Keeton's decision, I've decided they're 8 severable. And therefore, except for the enhancements, which must now be charged, pleaded, proved beyond a 9 10 reasonable doubt, other than prior convictions, I think that 11 the sentencing procedures are the law of the land. That's 12 why. 13 I think in view of the United States argument to 14 the Supreme Court in the alternative, I want to say that 15 your raising it even briefly as you have entitles you to raise it before the Court of Appeals as well. If you're 16 going to argue that they're entirely unconstitutional go 17 18 ahead. But I'm not getting into -- Baez, I got in that 19 situation because I was unprepared. I'm not unprepared 20 today. If they reverse me, on that argument, that they're 21 all, the whole thing's unconstitutional and it's within my 22 discretion, I'm out of this case unless they direct that I 23 conduct the resentencing. MR. HRONES: Yes. And I wondered why you were 24 25 saying it wouldn't be remanded to you for resentencing. I

- don't understand that.
- THE COURT: I'll make it very clear.
- In a case United States v. Gonczy I imposed a
- 4 sentence and was reversed. I've been reversed before.
- 5 Reversal doesn't trouble me in the least. And indeed, I
- 6 endorse everything that was said in the opinion. When I got
- 7 the mandate I was ordered off the case. And I, I have said
- 8 on the record before, that's the most stinging professional
- 9 insult and rebuke that I've had in all the time I've been a
- judge, and it's troubled me enormously.
- 11 MR. HRONES: And I agree. I read the decision and
- 12 I said it didn't, it didn't mention the mandate.
- 13 THE COURT: No.
- MR. HRONES: And I said why would he not be still
- on the case.
- 16 THE COURT: Well, the mandate takes me off the
- 17 case. But again, I have no trouble recusing myself off the
- 18 case. That's a little different. I did that in United
- 19 States v. Mills which was a similar situation. And the
- truth is, and I say it as straight as I know how, the truth,
- 21 that order by the Court above me so rankles and disturbs me,
- and candidly I'm afraid of it happening again, that the
- 23 only -- and that impairs, it seems to me, my independence in
- 24 sentencing, and I can't have that, I'm not the judge that I
- 25 should be. So now in every case I make this recitation,

- 1 that unless they tell me to stay on the case, and of course
- 2 I obey their orders, if you take an appeal and I'm reversed
- 3 in whole or in part -- it has nothing to do with this
- 4 individual. I'm not indicating --
- 5 MR. HRONES: Right.
- 6 THE COURT: -- because I don't think I should, nor
- 7 have I thought it through, what I would do if the guidelines
- 8 are entirely unconstitutional, though I don't think they
- are. This, this is a Gonczy issue. 9
- MR. HRONES: Yes. 10
- 11 THE COURT: I simply want to be free and I believe
- 12 it is my duty to be free to sentence as fairly and
- 13 intelligently as I know how without ever looking over my
- 14 shoulder for what they may do. And I'm going to do that.
- 15 And the only protection I have from being ordered off the
- 16 case again is to say on the record and to make it clear, if
- 17 they ever should see, look, if you reverse me on this you
- don't have to order me off the case, I'm taking myself off 18
- 19 the case without any further review of the merits.
- But you are entitled to know. It has nothing to do 20
- 21 with any feelings about this case.
- 22 MR. HRONES: Oh, no, I understand that, your Honor.
- 23 THE COURT: It's my procedure now following the
- 24 Gonczy case.
- 25 MR. HRONES: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll recess. MR. LEVITT: Thank you. THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess. (Whereupon the matter concluded.)